

## INTERVIEW SUMMARY OF ANNIE DOOKHAN

<b>Location:</b>	<b>MDPH Lab, Jamaica Plain</b>
<b>Date and Time</b>	<b>December 22, 2011 at 1:15 PM</b>
<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Steven Chilian, Deputy General Counsel Joel Buenaventura, Deputy General Counsel</b>
<b>Union Representation</b>	<b>Ann M. Looney, General Counsel Massachusetts Organization of State Engineers and Scientists</b>

Ms. Annie Dookhan (AD) has worked as a Chemist II at the MDPH Drug Forensic Lab for the past eight years. She reports to Charles Salemi. Her main duties are to analyze unknown substances for the MDPH Drug Forensic Lab.

AD provided an overview of the protocol for obtaining samples of unknown substances for testing. An evidence officer would assign the samples to her. Chemists would routinely go to a room known as “the evidence office.” Within the Evidence office, there was a room known as “the safe.” Only the Evidence Officers had access to the safe. An evidence officer would provide the samples, and the chemist would take the sample into his or her possession. The case samples would be bar coded with a lab control number for identification. As part of this process, the evidence officer and the chemist would record the transfer of these samples in a log book. After transfer from the evidence officer but during testing, the chemist would place the samples into a personal locker adjacent to the chemist’s laboratory bench. Only the chemist and the lab manager had keys to this locker. At any given time, there were about twenty to fifty samples kept in AD’s locker until either she returned the samples after completion of testing or she had taken new samples from the evidence officer.

AD verified the security measures created for the MDPH Drug Forensic Lab. AD said that there was a palm print required for access to the evidence office. AD had access to the evidence office, but not the safe. If she was allowed into the safe, it would only be in the presence of one of the evidence officers. AD would go to the evidence office only to receive samples or if she needed assistance in looking up a drug name.

AD was asked to provide her recollection of the reported incident of June 2011. AD was also provided a copy of pages of the log book involving ninety affected samples dated June 14, 2011.

AD recalled meeting with Betsy O’Brien, Chuck Salemi, and Julie Nassif on June 21, 2011. AD had no recollection of how she obtained the samples in question. She did not remember which evidence officer gave the said samples to her.

When queried regarding the laboratory log book, which included the initials of the evidence officer “GP” and AD, AD verified her own initials. AD said that she may have

initialed receipt of the samples “after the fact.” That is, although the lab book is dated that AD received the samples on June 14, 2011, she recalls that she likely initialed receipt of the samples on a later date. Although she acknowledged that there had been initials from the evidence officer “GP”, she denied that it was her writing. However, AD indicated that “she writes that way.”

AD acknowledged that there would likely be problems testifying regard to the ninety samples because of the aforementioned discrepancies in the log book. AD said that the samples would likely have been kept in her locker after receipt from the evidence officer and the testing process which include her initial test and a confirmatory test from another chemist in the lab.

AD recalls that she had not been questioned regarding the log book when she has given testimony in a criminal matter. AD said she would cooperate in identifying any cases in which she had been subpoenaed by the District Attorney if provided a copy of the affected sample numbers.